

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-25 are now present in the application. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 14-25 have been added. Claims 1 and 14 are independent. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Song, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0135264, in view of Park, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0105247. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

In light of the foregoing amendments to the claims, Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection has been obviated and/or rendered moot. Without conceding to the propriety of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to timely advance the prosecution of the application, as the Examiner will note, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a combination of elements including "an outer stator having a plurality of radially stacked first lamination sheets around a bobbin in which a winding coil is wound, each of the first lamination sheets being radial with respect to the center of the bobbin", "a terminal part provided at one side of the outer stator for connecting an external power to the winding coil of the outer stator" and "a magnetic force balancing part at which the first lamination sheets are not stacked, provided at the outer stator at the same interval on the basis of the terminal part in a circumferential direction of the outer

stator.” Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner.

The Examiner in the “Response to Arguments” section of the outstanding Office Action alleged as follows:

Even though the lamination sheets of Park are shown to be parallel, a person of ordinary skill in the art can still *apply the lamination sheet free sectors of Park in the reference of Song et al. and still maintain the radial stacking of lamination sheets as shown by Song et al.*, i.e., a lamination sheet free sector the same shape as the terminal part of Song et al., for the purpose of forming an electromagnetic field between the outer stator and the inner stator that is more uniform. (Emphasis added.)

Applicant respectfully disagrees. As shown in FIGs. 4, 5 and 7 of Park, the lamination-sheet-free sectors are made by using the core members 61, which are formed by stacking a plurality of parallel lamination sheets. Without using the parallel lamination sheets, the lamination-sheet-free sectors will not exist. This is self-explained in Park itself because, as shown in FIG. 2 of Park, the lamination sheets 11 are radially stacked and therefore cannot provide lamination-sheet-free sector. By using the core members 61 made of parallel lamination sheets as shown in FIGs. 4, 5 and 7 of Park, the lamination-sheet-free sectors can then be provided between adjacent core members 61. Therefore, if one skilled in the art applied the lamination-sheet-free sectors of Park to Song, Song’s lamination sheets would need to be parallel like Park’s core members 61 and cannot maintain the radially stacked structure. Accordingly, the combination of Song and Park fails to teach “an outer stator having a plurality of radially stacked first lamination sheets around a bobbin” as recited in independent claim 1.

In addition, as mentioned, since the combined outer stator has core members 61 made of parallel lamination sheets, not all of the lamination sheets are in the radial direction of the bobbin.

Therefore, the combination of Song and Park also fails to teach “each of the first lamination sheets being radial with respect to the center of the bobbin” as recited in amended claim 1.

Furthermore, one skilled in the art would not have the motivation to apply Park to Song’s radially stacked lamination sheet structure. In particular, Park in paragraph [0010] states as follows:

However, according to the above structure, *because the plurality of lamination sheets 11 must be radially stacked to be cylindrical in fabricating the outer core 10 including the winding coil 30, it takes long to stack the lamination sheets 11... Accordingly, assembly productivity deteriorates.* (Emphasis added.)

In other words, Park clearly teaches away from using Song’s radially stacked lamination sheets due to its deteriorated assembly productivity. Therefore, it is improper to combine Song and Park in the first place, not to mention the fact that the combination of Song and Park still fails to teach “an outer stator having a plurality of radially stacked first lamination sheets around a bobbin” as recited in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, neither Song nor Park individually or in combination teaches or suggests the limitations of independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 clearly defines over the teachings of Song and Park.

In addition, claims 2-13 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1, and are therefore allowable based on their respective dependence from independent claim 1, which is believed to be allowable.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-13 clearly define the present invention over the references relied on by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

Additional Claims

Claims 14-25 have been added for the Examiner's consideration.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of elements as set forth in new independent claim 14 is not disclosed or suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner.

In addition, claims 15-25 depend, either directly or indirectly, from new independent claim 14, and are therefore allowable based on their respective dependence from new independent claim 14, which is believed to be allowable.

Favorable consideration and allowance of claims 14-25 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant respectfully petitions for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a response in connection with the present application.

Application No. 10/539,583
Amendment dated November 13, 2007
Reply to Office Action of July 10, 2007

Docket No.: 0630-2354PUS1

Page **12 of 12**

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: November 13, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

James T. Eller, Jr.

Registration No.: 39,538

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

